

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/488,079**

Applicant(s)  
**Montague**

Examiner  
**James W. Myhre**

Art Unit  
**3622**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) Jack Pate

(2) Dan Nelson

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview May 22, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Dlugos et al (5,153,842) and Abbott et al (3,562,727)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the cited reference, stressing that Dlugos did not disclose that the label was readable by the customer and that the computer readable medium was linked to the product and the label. After much discussion of how to best delineate and clarify these features in the claims, terminology was agreed upon which would differentiate the amended Claim 1 from Dlugos. The Applicant will submit an amendment incorporating the amended terminology. The Examiner noted while this may overcome the Dlugos reference, further search would be required to determine the patentability of the invention in the amended claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**JAMES W. MYHRE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3622**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required